



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/849,618	05/19/2004	Frank Niebuhr	60130-2082; 03MRA0207	6549
26096	7590	03/05/2007	EXAMINER	
CARLSON, GASKEY & OLDS, P.C.			KUHNS, ALLAN R	
400 WEST MAPLE ROAD			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
SUITE 350			1732	
BIRMINGHAM, MI 48009				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
03/05/2007		PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/849,618	NIEBUHR ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Allan Kuhns	1732

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 18 January 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

- a) The period for reply expires _____ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.

Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

NOTICE OF APPEAL

2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on _____. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

AMENDMENTS

3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because

- (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);
- (c) They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: _____. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): _____.

6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) _____ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: _____.

Claim(s) objected to: _____.

Claim(s) rejected: _____.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: _____.

AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8. The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10. The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:
See Continuation Sheet.

12. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). _____

13. Other: _____.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicants' arguments are not persuasive. Applicants argue that Yamazaki does not disclose, suggest or teach the step of reworking a removable protective foil as defined in the claims and that the tensioning of the insert film of Yamazaki is merely part of the positioning step of placing the insert film in the die and does not itself constitute a "reworking" of the foil. First of all, this ground of rejection is based on the admitted prior art in view of Yamazaki, and the foil of the admitted prior art is removable and removed. The tensioning step of Yamazaki at column 14, lines 63-67 prevents wrinkles or twists in the film (a smoothing of the outer side of the foil), as viewed by the examiner. This act by Yamazaki would be considered a "reworking" when combined with the process of the admitted prior art since the foil of the admitted prior art has already been "worked" to some extent by disposing it on an outer skin before sending it for back foaming. It is the examiner's position that the teaching of Yamazaki relied upon by the examiner is not negated by any lack of desire to subsequently remove the foil or film layer.

Applicants' arguments concerning claim 3 are not persuasive because the back foaming in the process of the admitted prior art indeed occurs after step b. It is submitted that the term "reshaping", as in claim 4, can reasonably be interpreted so broadly as occurring during the shaping of the foil and the skin. Applicants argue that the admitted prior art does not suggest the required order of steps of claim 22. The examiner still disagrees because the admitted prior art teaches or suggests the basic order of steps required by claim 22 because any lack of smoothness in the foil/outer skin combination would not be a concern to one of ordinary skill in the art until it is provided in step a, and the back foaming of step d would clearly occur after the positioning of the foil/outer skin in a die. Applicants' arguments concerning the Gossie reference are also noted by the examiner, but it is the examiner's position that that substantially the same reasoning set forth above with regard to Yamazaki is also applicable to Gossie.

Allan R. Kuhs

ALLAN R. KUHS
PRIMARY EXAMINER AU 1732

3-2-07